

Exhibit 1

1
2
34
5
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA6
7
SUN MICROSYSTEMS INC., ET AL. v. Case No. C-06-01665 PJH (JCS)(Consolidated)
HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., ET AL., Case No. C-06-02915 PJH (JCS)
(Case No. C-06-01665 PJH (Consolidated)) Case No. C-07-01200 PJH (JCS)
Case No. C-07-01207 PJH (JCS)
Case No. C-07-01212 PJH (JCS)
Case No. C-07-01381 PJH (JCS)
8
9
UNISYS CORPORATION v. HYNIX
SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., ET AL.
(Case No. C-06-02915 PJH)
10
11
ALL AMERICAN SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.
v. HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., ET AL.
(Case No. C-07-01200 PJH)
12
13
EDGE ELECTRONICS, INC., v. HYNIX
SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., ET AL.
(Case No. C-07-01207 PJH)
14
15
JACO ELECTRONICS, INC., v. HYNIX
SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., ET AL.
(Case No. C-07-01212 PJH)
16
17
DRAM CLAIMS LIQUIDATION TRUST,
BY ITS TRUSTEE WELLS FARGO BANK,
N.A. v. HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
ET AL.
(Case No. C-07-01381 PJH)
18
19
/20
21
Defendants and Plaintiffs in these cases submitted a joint letter dated December 28, 2007,
regarding settlement agreements (the “motion”). The motion came on for hearing on January 25,
2008, at 9:30 a.m. The following counsel appeared: David Cross, Jerome Murphy, and Kerry
Malloy (Sun/Unisys); James McCarthy (DRAM Liquidation Trust); Joshua Hess (Micron); Steven
Bergman (Hynix); Harrison Frahn IV and Jason Bussey (Elpida); Julian Brew (Infineon); Eva Chan
(NEC Electronics America/NEC); and Howard Ullman (Nanya). For the reasons stated on the
record and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:22
23
24
25
26
27
28
1. After the filing of any motion for summary judgment in which the testimony or
declaration of any employee or former employee of a settling defendant is cited, anyORDER RE JOINT LETTER OF
DECEMBER 28, 2007Docket Numbers: 256 (C-06-01665)
177 (C-06-02915)
126 (C-07-01200)
130 (C-06-01207)
127 (C-07-01212)
212 (C-07-01381)

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 party may apply to the undersigned for the disclosure of settlement agreements
2 entered into between the plaintiff and the relevant settling defendant in such an
3 action. The Court will consider such applications on an expedited basis. Application
4 for disclosure of the relevant settlement agreements may be made by a two-page
5 letter. Oppositions shall be due within forty-eight (48) hours and will also consist of
6 a two-page letter. The parties are directed to meet and confer in advance of such an
7 application in an effort to resolve the dispute.

8 2. In each of these cases, thirty (30) days before the pretrial conference statement is due,
9 plaintiff shall produce to defense counsel all settlement agreements between plaintiff
10 and any settling defendant in such action.

11 3. All settlement agreements produced pursuant to this Order shall be produced on an
12 "attorneys' eyes only" basis under the Protective Order in this matter.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14
15 Dated: January 25, 2008

16 
17 JOSEPH C. SPERO
United States Magistrate Judge

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28